

**Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project - US Army COE Coordination Meeting  
Summary Notes. Meeting held at Ft. Shafter COE Regulatory Office, Honolulu, HI. January  
15, 2009**

**Participants:**

COE: George Young, Susan Meyer, Lindsey Kasperowicz, Joy Anamizu, Farley Watanabe

RTD: Faith Miyamoto, Susan Robbins

PB: Lawrence Spurgeon, Amy Zaref

**Update on Field Work for Jurisdictional Determination**

- Oceanit will be performing field work as sub consultant to PB
- COE expects that all waters of the US including wetlands be studied (i.e., where we are placing columns in waters, columns adjacent to water on bank or where elevated guideway crosses stream even if no direct impact), need to include areas of permanent and temporary impact (i.e., construction areas, borrow areas, staging areas based on what we know now)
- Section 10 waters include tidal areas of those streams as well
- Use the existing COE guidelines published in December
- Corps website has final jurisdictional determinations from the last several years.
- Corps will have to let us know where permits will be necessary
- Data should provide enough information for COE to make Section 10 and 404 jurisdictional determination
- Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) and Marine High Water Mark (MHWM)– field observations should be used to determine (new guidance is coming, not yet available, not required for this project since will not be in place at present time)
- Oceanit will review data collection method with COE after completing a few sites
- Provide Corps with lists of stream crossings, with High Water data as soon as possible.
- Section 10 crossings likely to be bigger issue than wetlands delineations
- PB noted they will indicate the range of construction methods at stream crossings in the FEIS

**USFWS Coordination**

- RTD/PB met with natural resource agencies including USFWS, there was no concern raised at that meeting or in previous correspondence. USFWS only had concerns about *Abutilon menziesii*
- Need correspondence from USFWS to say that they have no concerns with T&E species, including aquatic T&E species (anticipating comments on DEIS). "Informal" consultation may not be sufficient
- FTA needs to send effects determination to USFWS for concurrence

**DEIS and Technical Reports Overview and Review of previous COE comments during AA and NEPA Process**

- Discussed range of alternatives in DEIS. Explained FTA process that NEPA is integrated with planning process. Alternatives Analysis was prepared to explore the wide range of alternatives and determine alternatives to carry forward for further study in DEIS
- COE would like more information for them to go through their 404 (b)(1) process – LEDPA. Needed because individual 404 permit will be required and COE would like to adopt FTA's FEIS and then issue their own ROD based on FTA FEIS.
- Ideally, we would prepare a Draft 404 (1)(b) analysis as an Appendix to the FEIS, and submit it to the COE.
- RTD will provide COE with more information to make LEDPA decision. Specific content and format will be discussed in future coordination meetings.
- We are not likely eligible for a Nationwide permit for the entire project length.
- We must document the process of avoidance and mitigation.

- Discussed project schedule milestones: FEIS to public summer
- Agency review periods have been changed from 15 days to 30 days. The COE will be reviewing the Navy's EIS for Guam buildup in May. We should avoid May for COE review.
- We need functional evaluation/assessment of both wetlands and streams.
- Evidence of 401 Certification is necessary before the permit.

**Follow-up Actions**

- PB will get Susan Meyers FTA contacts.
- Susan Meyers will send us a White Paper of what COE is expecting from us, after it is vetted by George and Lindsey.